Development Authority.

Supply of Drinking Water in Gujarat

2093. SHRI AHMED PATEL: Will the Minister of RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have identified all the not-covered and partially-covered habitats in Gujarat, to be provided with safe drinking water;

(b) if so, what are the details thereof, district-wise;

(c) whether all the habitats in the State have been provided safe drinking water; and

(d) if not, by when all the habitats in the state are likely to be provided with safe drinking water?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI CHANDRA-DEO PRASAD VARMA): (a) and (b) A survey was conducted in 1991-93 and validated in 1994 to indentify not covered partially covered and fully covered habitations with safe drinking water facilities. The districtwise details is given at Annexure-. *[See* Appendix 179, Annexure No. 44]

(c) No, Sir.

(d) All the State Governments including the State Government of Gujarat have been requested to prepare action plan for providing safe drinking water to all the not covered and partially covered (upto 10 lpcd) habitations by 1997-98.

Per capita income

2094. SHRI SANJAY DALMIA: Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state:

(a) the per capita income on the basis of constant prices during the last three years, State-wise and year-wise;

(b) the States which could not achieve the target of national average of per capita income during the two decades of planning;

(c) the reasons for having less per capita income in those States; and

(d) the steps taken to expedite the developmental process in those States?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH): (a) The information is given in the statement *(see* below).

(b) The States whose Per Capita Net State Domestic Products (NSDP) is continuously less than the Per Capita Net National Product, since 1980-81 are Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tripura and Uttar Pradesh.

(c) Uneven development of infrastructure, agriculture and industry in various regions, and differences in productivity of investment are reasons for the differences in Per Capita NSDP between States, the same being high in some and low in some others.

(d) The State Governments are implementing development plans for increasing income, the Central Government provides Central Assistance for State Plans according to a formula in which higher weightage is given to the States which have lower per capita income.

Statement

Per capita net state domestic product at constant prices

(1980-81 to 1995-96)
AS ON 8.11.1996

(Rs.)

SI. No.	State/U.T.	1993-94 (P)	1994-95 (Q)	1995-96 (A)
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1908	1859	—
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	3058	3076	—
3.	Assam	1583	1720	—
4.	Bihar	1042	1067	—
5.	Goa	5459	5341	—
6.	Gujarat	2859	3217	—
7.	Haryana	3538	3683	—
8.	Himachal Pradesh	2307	2381	—
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	1832	—	—
10.	Karnataka	2423	2501	—
11.	Kerala	2043	2113	—
12.	Madhya Pradesh	1766	1738	—
13.	Maharashtra	3980	4157	—
14.	Manipur	1921	—	—
15.	Meghalaya	1698	1835	—
16.	Nagaland	2170		
17.	Orissa	1542	1581	1607
18.	Punjab	4053	4167	—
19.	Rajasthan	1760	1016	—
20.	Sikkim	—	—	—
21.	Tamil Nadu	2498	2656	2676
22.	Tripura	—	—	—
23.	Uttar Pradesh	1638	1663	—
24.	West Bengal	2323	2434	—
25.	A & N Islands	3004	3081	—
26.	Delhi	5547	—	—
27.	Pondicherry	3325	—	—

Quick Estimates P= Provisional A + Advance

—Note made available by the concerned State Governments.

Source: Directorate of Economics & Statistics of respective State Governments and C.S.O. for All India Per Capita NNP and NDP. The figures of Per Capita NDP are not published in NAS.

Note 1: Owing to differences in source material used the figures for different State/UTs are not strictly comparable.

Note 2: The State of Mizeoram prepares these estimates at current prices only.

Note 3: The UTs of Chandigarh, Dadra & Nager Haveli, Daman & Diu and Lakshadweep do not prepare these estimates.